

Evening Telegraph

PUBLISHED EVERY AFTERNOON. (SUNDAYS EXCEPTED) AT THE EVENING TELEGRAPH BUILDING, NO. 108 S. THIRD STREET.

Price, Three Cents per Copy (Double Sheet), or Eighteen Cents per Week, payable to the Carrier, and mailed to Subscribers out of the city at Nine Dollars per Annum; One Dollar and Fifty Cents for Two Months, invariably in advance for the period ordered.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1867.

The following is an extract from a speech delivered by Judge Ludlow in the Hall of the Washington Engine Company:—

"IF WILLIAM H. SEWARD SHOULD BE ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WOULD BE IN FAVOR OF A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION, and, moreover, the South would be justified in dissolving the Union in case of such an event."

The Campaign of 1867.

This evening sees the close of the brief though bitter campaign of 1867. It has been an anomalous one on the part of the Democracy, and an active one so far as the Republican party was concerned. By the time that this has met the eyes of our readers, the excitement of debate will have almost subsided, and the people have gathered themselves up for the final action on the morrow. In looking back over our share in the contest, we see nothing we would retract, not a word or line which we would erase. We have sought to treat those of our opponents who were entitled to respect in as courteous a manner as was possible. We think we have succeeded. While we have opposed them more strongly than any other paper in our city, yet we do not think that even our enemies will accuse us of having violated the rules of courtesy. We have studiously refrained from attacking any of our opponents personally. In the cases of the Judges we have gone further, and given them all the claims of individual worth which their friends demand for them. In this respect our course will compare most favorably with that of our Democratic neighbor, which has vilified our candidates, and thrown aside all the rules of decency in its scurrilous abuse. We sought to elevate the contest above mere personality, and so far as we are concerned, we do not see anything in our expressions of opinion which should merit retraction.

The contest, as it is to-day presented to our people, differs but little from that of last year. The great antagonism between Andrew Johnson and the people still continues. To-day, as a year ago, the question to be decided at the polls is whether or not the course of the President meets the approval of the people. If any Democrat is elected to-morrow, it will be hailed as a triumph for Andrew Johnson. After the election, we will hear no more of personal popularity or a war record. It will be a party triumph, and over all the land will go the tidings that Philadelphia, the citadel of loyalty, the stronghold of Republicanism, that city which refused to do honor to Andrew Johnson, and which has ever been the warmest in its sympathy for the cause of Union, that it has to-day been carried for the President, and the might of the radicals has been broken. We envy not the responsibility of those Republicans who will thus endanger the clear record of our city, and place Philadelphia along with New York in her adhesion to the cause of Mr. Johnson. We repeat that, if Judge Ludlow, or Mr. Lyle, or any Democrat is elected in Philadelphia, it will be heralded from Maine to Texas that the Quaker City has given way, and that the Administration has triumphed in the very Gibraltar of the radical faith. Fellow Republican citizens, are you willing to have such a despatch flash over the wires, disheartening our friends and inspiring our enemy? Shall we by our votes thus place our city in this false attitude, and by the moral force of her example endanger our sister State of New York? We beseech those Republicans who have been earnest during the war—who lent all the weight of their influence to discountenance treason, to hesitate before they scratch a single name from our regular ticket. It is not a question of men—it is a question of principle. Those whom we might support as personal friends; if found in the ranks of the enemy, upholding the banner of Andrew Johnson, we shall oppose with all our might.

It behooves our citizens to think of the consequences. We are no alarmists. We are not striving for political capital; but as between man and man, loyal citizen to loyal citizen, we say to you that if the Democratic party

succeeds to-morrow, God save our country from the mad exultation of Andrew Johnson intoxicated with what he will deem a reaction in the North in favor of his schemes, he will dare anything; and we tremble when we think of what acts of tyranny he may essay to do. The country is on the brink of another civil war. If Andrew Johnson is endorsed, he will attempt deeds which will arouse the nation, and then there will not be left one stone upon another throughout all the rebellious South. The spirit of the people is long suffering, but it will not endure forever; and when Andrew Johnson attempts his new deeds of violence, as he will if the Democracy succeeds, there will be such a scene in the North as will rival the early days of 1861. It has been authoritatively stated by those who have the President's confidence, that he is but "laying on his oars," and waiting to see the result of the election in Pennsylvania. We have no reason to doubt but that this is true, and upon the result will be founded his decision. If we rebuke this usurper and elect the Republican nominee, then all danger will be past. The vindictive Executive is a coward at heart, and unless encouraged will not dare to continue in his career of violence. But if seemingly supported there are no lengths too great for him to go. By our success, then, safety is assured; by our defeat great danger is incurred. Can we hesitate? Can loyal Philadelphia hesitate one moment in her choice between such an alternative. Let those who support Andrew Johnson at any cost vote for his representatives—the Democratic nominees; but let those who discountenance his acts and fear to encourage his violence, vote the entire Republican ticket without scratching.

Citizens! Patriots! Soldiers! to you we utter one last appeal. The destiny of the country is in your hands. Will you save it by decided action in favor of the old cause, in whose support you have so often aided, or will you by default, or actual opposition, precipitate our suffering country into new dangers, and possibly new wars? Let each think well of his action, and act as he will give an account as a citizen of our great free country, as a patriot and as a man.

"Coriolanus" Lyle.

Mr. P. LYLE has assumed a grand rôle, and has determined to rival Forrest in his personations of "Coriolanus." The morning papers contain a card from the Democratic candidate for Sheriff, in which he stands before the people and humbly craves their suffrages, showing to their astonished eyes his wounds. Mr. Lyle thinks we have gone back to the days of ancient Rome, and that it is essential to success to come in person and cringe and fawn before the people, praying "my good sirs" to give him their votes. He seems to think that by turning a beggar he can weary the people of Philadelphia with his impertinence, and thus gain their votes. The sight of a "gallant soldier" parading his deeds before his fellow-citizens, calling on them, "Look on me, a hero of twenty-eight battles; see what I have done; give me your votes," is one which makes us blush for self-respect, and for the absence of that true spirit of modesty which should characterize a real soldier. In his self-advertisement we find the following record of his services, a sort of modest autobiography:—

"During these campaigns I was with my command in twenty-eight battles; and it is a matter of sincere pride to me that my conduct then, and at all other times, received the full commendations of my superior officers. It has been my good fortune also to have instructed in military duty more than six hundred of the officers who served in the national army during the war against the Rebellion."

Oh, modest veteran! Why, he does not even boast of a Menesius to sound his praises. What a consul he would have made for Rome! How well he would have figured in such a scene as ruined "Coriolanus"! How he would have cringed and begged, and never hesitated to show his wounds! No keeping them in private from the people. He would have exposed them in the forum, and gloried in the exposure. With all earnestness, and without the sarcasm of the ancient Roman, he is to-day saying to all who will listen:—

"Here come more voices— Your voices for your voices I have fought; Watched for your voices; for your voices, bear O wounds two dozen odd; battles three six I have seen, and heard of; for your voices have done many things, some less, some more; for your voices: Indeed, I would be consul."

It remains to be seen whether this sacrifice of self-respect, of soldierly modesty, of decency, will receive its reward, or whether the people will turn to the old Roman standard and judge of a man by his own words. We rather think that greater weight would have been added to "Coriolanus" Lyle's words if he had allowed some one else to sound his praises. The glory of his history may be well calculated for Roman admiration, but it seems to us that if the wounds were pointed out by another it would have greatly heightened the dramatic effect. Despite his self-abasement, we fear our modern "Coriolanus" will, like his namesake of old, lose his wished-for office. He will not then go to the Volscians, for he has gone to them already.

The following is an extract from a speech delivered by Judge Ludlow in the Hall of the Washington Engine Company:— "IF WILLIAM H. SEWARD SHOULD BE ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WOULD BE IN FAVOR OF A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION, and, moreover, the South would be justified in dissolving the Union in case of such an event."

The National Period. If Andrew Johnson be an honest patriot at heart, and striving to do what he can to restore justice and harmony to the country, he is so stupidly ignorant, so woefully mistaken, so perversely counselled, so desperately obstinate, that he succeeds only in casting himself before the wheels of progress at every step that he takes. But among his eccentricities is a pretended reliance on the voice of the people. A more consummate coward was never entrusted with the destinies of a great nation. He has not the courage to adopt a "policy" upon its merits, and then, like old Davy Crockett, being once sure that he is right, "to go ahead." He is perpetually appealing to the people here and there, forever in doubt as to whether he has interpreted aright the vox Dei which speaks through the vox populi. In this way alone can we account for the hesitation which has marked his course of late. He has, without any qualification, pronounced the so-called Military bills passed at the last two sessions of Congress unconstitutional, and yet he has attempted to enforce them after a fashion. No sooner has he selected the agents for carrying out their provisions than he complains of the interpretation which is put upon them, and Sheridan and Sickles are relieved of their commands. And then he appoints as their successors tried soldiers, whose first official acts are confirmatory of every vital measure of their predecessors.

The fruits of this vacillation are seen on all sides. By his denunciation of the acts of Congress he has inspired the unrepentant Rebels with hope; and by the assignment of such soldiers as Sheridan, Sickles, Hancock, and Canby to the command of the Military Districts, he has disgusted his adherents in the Northern States. And now he has paused in anxiety and alarm, to await the result of the elections which are to be held to-morrow in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Iowa. Once more he appeals to the people, and once more the voice of the people will be heard. If the Democratic party bears off the palm in these three great States, Andrew Johnson will pick up fresh courage, and when Congress meets in November they will find him just as obstinate and just as stupid as they found him on the 5th of July last. But if Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Iowa speak out in tones that are not to be mistaken, we imagine that the task of Congress will be comparatively an easy one, and that the only impediments which will be thrown in its way will be the harmless protestations of the man who accidentally occupies the chief position in the nation. The forcible installation of the unreconstructed members from the Southern States is again revived and discussed by the adherents of the President, and if the result of the elections to-morrow be favorable to this scheme, the cause of liberty, justice, and harmony will be placed in great peril. Backed by the voice of three great States, and by the counsel of such men as Seward and Stanbery, the mischief that Andrew Johnson may work will be incalculable, even if he fail in his attempt to force upon Congress men whom that body has solemnly and repeatedly declared it will not receive. The duty of the people is therefore plain. Let them thunder forth from the ballot-box their condemnation of "my policy" in all its variations and vacillations. Let Andrew Johnson have before him the unmistakable assurance that the nation estimates him at his true worth.

Remember Your Duty To-morrow.

If the Democratic ticket succeeds at the polls in this city to-morrow, it will result only from the apathy of the Republican voters. No reasonable man doubts that we have a clear majority of several thousands on the list of taxable inhabitants. The total registry last year amounted to 141,898; while the total vote for Governor was 103,022. The registry this year foots up 144,272, and if the 38,776 voters who kept away from the polls in 1866 will present themselves to-morrow, our average majority of 4576 will be swelled to 25,000 at the least. Republicans, you can rest assured that the great majority of the non-voters are a part and parcel of your own numbers. The time-honored maxim of your opponents is to "vote early and vote often," and to cast at least one ballot is regarded by the Democracy as a religious duty, of which but few of them fall short. If you are equally earnest and equally active, the city is safe by a majority that will strike consternation into the heart of Andrew Johnson and all his satellites. Do not forget your own vote; and when that is deposited drum up your apathetic neighbors. Let no man who is known to be a Republican be suffered to neglect his duty to the country and to the principles he professes to cherish.

Another Proclamation!

MR. PETER LYLE publishes another card this morning, from which we extract all the material points:—

"To the Public—408 South Ninth street, Oct. 5, 1867.—The communication appearing in several newspapers to the effect, purporting to be a correct copy of a speech made before the Democratic Convention, I pronounced incorrect. The one published in THE EVENING TELEGRAPH, and the signature of Mr. McCARRAN, is the correct one. I have refrained from answering these communications, not wishing to be brought into a newspaper controversy. Trusting this will be satisfactory, I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant, PETER LYLE."

We desire, in connection with his denial, to state that the report published by us is sworn to by a professional phonographer, a Democrat, and that it was taken down word by word as it fell from Mr. Lyle's lips; that it has not been altered, either by transposition, addition, or omission. It is a verbatim report, exact in every particular. There were hundreds of persons present who heard that speech. They know whether or not our report of it is true. If it is garbled, then let the auditors come out and swear to its falsity, as we have it sworn to as true. It has been published daily in our columns for two weeks, and if it was garbled, there have been many chances of Mr. Lyle's having said so before. He now denies it, as a last card, when it is too late for us to bring other witnesses to substantiate our report. It is too late for any such denial. The time has gone by in silence, and no one who heard it has ventured to question its truth. Let the people think of it. All the Republicans are "radical rascals," and the injured Lyle was elected last year. If any of our people wish to lick the hand that smites them, to return good for evil, and to tamely accept insult and outrage, let them vote for this arrogant politician, who calls them "cheats" and "rascals." Denial is useless. The report of Mr. Lyle's speech, as published by us, is correct in every respect.

Another Democratic Rebellion Threatened. An article in a late number of the Pittsburgh Post, the leading Democratic journal of Western Pennsylvania, published by James P. Barr, late Surveyor-General of this State, recommends Andrew Johnson to employ the army of the United States to "assert his rights and put aside Congress," and promises him that "the Democracy will be found faithful, as they were in the days of Jackson, and will stand by the President," etc. After referring to Jackson's answer to the Bank men, when they threatened rebellion, this article, absurdly placing Congress in an attitude similar to theirs, proceeds as follows:—

"President Johnson will act up to the moral courage and firmness of the Patriot of the Hermitage, the country will be united, the people prosperous and happy. The impeachment will fail to the ground by the power and will of the Executive, who by the Constitution is clothed with the calling out of the army and navy to defend the nation, and should the President allow himself to be insulted by an obnoxious Congress, and the dignity of the people set at naught, then indeed does he deserve the punishment which a vindictive opposition would mete out to him by dragging him before a Senate who have already passed sentence upon him. The people, who are the power in the Government, should not allow their President to be disgraced by a fanatical, black partisan spirit. Sooner than this calamity should take place, let him look to the commission under which, and from which he derives his power, and by virtue of this he is made Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy, and by this commission, which he is sworn to observe and obey, let him exhibit to the world that he will be President over all the States in despite of destruction, should it take blood to sprinkle the pillars of the Capitol. Let the President assert his rights and put aside Congress, and let him grant the people their rights under the Constitution, which he is bound to do, and let him assert at the rights under and by which he holds power, by whatever measure it is for the interest of our country for him to adopt. The Democracy will be found faithful as they were in the days of Jackson, and will stand by the President."

This advice to Mr. Johnson accords with the spirit that inspired the Rebellion and that now animates the unrepentant ex-Rebels and their friends, the Democrats of the North, and is in keeping with Governor Swann's course in organizing his State militia under the command of men who fought in the Rebel army. Should the Democrats succeed to-morrow in Pennsylvania and Ohio, we should soon find all the Democratic journals advising the President to disperse Congress at the point of the bayonet, to disregard the Reconstruction laws, and to open the doors of the Capitol to members of Congress chosen by the rebel-handled Rebels of the South, and to the few Democrats elected in the North. The plan foreshadowed, not long since, in the celebrated Ledger despatch, may yet be put into execution. Johnson is capable of any desperate act, lacking only the requisite courage; and the success of his friends in the great central States of the North might furnish him with this. In 1860, the success of the Republicans caused a Rebellion. In 1867, the success of the Democrats might cause another, by encouraging them and their Southern allies to attempt the completion of the original revolt. There is no doubt that Democratic victories in a few of the principal Northern States would encourage Andrew Johnson to acts of greater violence than he has yet committed, and it is not probable that he would employ force against the lawful and legal representatives of the people. What would be the consequence of such an act, we need not now attempt to show. The reader can readily foresee what would ensue, and how the conflict thus provoked would result. But let us prevent the possibility of such a direful occurrence, by the potent but peaceful means of the ballot to-morrow. Let Pennsylvania do her duty with the ballot to-morrow, and Andrew Johnson will not dare resort to the bullet, and the country will be spared a second bloody war, such as the traitorous writer in the Pittsburgh Post advises his friend the President to inaugurate.

This morning's New York Tribune, commenting on our election, concludes as follows:—"Judge Sharswood's friends expect to gain for him some Republican votes in Philadelphia and other eastern counties where he is known, in spite of the fact that his opinions from the bench would have paralyzed the Government and destroyed the Union, had they not been overruled. He decided that the Federal Government had no right to make its paper money a legal-tender, and that the act of enrolling and calling out the national forces was unconstitutional. Had those opinions been sustained, the Southern Confederacy must have been fully triumphant, and its independence recognized ere this; and such, we cannot doubt, was his purpose in making these decisions. We cannot see how Republicans can vote for such a candidate; yet some will do it. We trust they are too few to elect him."

If there be a single Pennsylvania Republican who sees this sheet and has yet time to reach the poll of his district in time, we exhort him not to fail to vote for Henry W. Williams and the whole Republican ticket."

What our Leading Men Say To-day. We have been told that the people should vote for Judge Ludlow because his election is favored by a number of our leading citizens, whose names have been laid before us again and again. We have often repeated that those gentlemen were to-day opposed to the election of Judge Ludlow because he had changed his attitude, because the fight has degenerated into a political one, and that to-day they favor the election of Mr. Thayer. We let them speak for themselves. The names we give are out of a long list signed to the circular by those who had previously signed the "Ludlow call."

"To the Citizens of Philadelphia:—So strange and so artificial have been the efforts to divert your attention from the true issues at stake in the approaching election, that we feel it a duty to remind you of the vast interests which depend upon your votes. It is not a mere local struggle. It is not a question who is to be Sheriff, or Treasurer, or Judge. Mr. Johnson and his allies, in their efforts to neutralize the defeat of the Rebellion, have appealed to the people of the North, and they will read in the majorities which you will cast on Tuesday the sentence whether they are triumphant or defeated. Mr. Johnson has arrogated to himself legislative as well as executive functions, and has appealed to you, through his Democratic allies, for support. By your votes on Tuesday you are to decide whether you approve of his usurpation, or whether you stand as a record that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Here then is a retraction from these gentlemen—from all of them. They do not declare against Judge Ludlow by name, but they state that it is not a question of who shall be Sheriff, or Treasurer, or Judge. They see as clearly as we do, that if any Republican votes for Judge Ludlow he votes against his party and in favor of a most bitter exponent of the doctrines of the Democracy. We say nothing against Judge Ludlow as a man, but as a politician we cannot give him even a silent support. We knew that the very men who attempted to elevate the Judgeship above partisanship would, now that they have failed, be found side by side with their old comrades. If the question could have been settled without a battle, these gentlemen desired it. But in the event of a contest they are unwilling to be found side by side with their ancient enemy. We are now in the midst of the battle, and we find our friends back in the ranks. The following gentlemen having some weeks ago favored Judge Ludlow as a no-party candidate, to-day retract their support from him and call on all good citizens to oppose a triumph of Andrew Johnson and vote against the Democratic nominees, for "it is not a question of who shall be Sheriff, or Treasurer, or Judge!"

William M. Meredith, George H. Stuart, Isaac Hazellhurst, Samuel H. Perkins, Daniel Smith, Jr., Frederick Fraley, Henry C. Lea, J. G. Fell, James Pollock, William Sellers, Andrew Wheeler, Charles Gibbons, Edward Shippen, Arthur G. Coffin, Caleb Cope, A. E. Borie, Evan Randolph, Horace Binney, Jr., Stephen A. Caldwell, M. Carey Lea, William McMichael, George H. Boker, Henry Perkins, Clarence H. Clark, John H. Keefe, Charles T. Proby, Benj. Bullock's Sons, Wetherill & Brother, Horace Binney.

There are others who have signed this counter call who had also signed the first Ludlow circular; but we have not space to make room for them here. Elsewhere will be found the entire list. These gentlemen thus cancel what they have previously said, and call on their fellow-citizens in this great contest to vote against Andrew Johnson, and to support the Republican candidates for Sheriff, Treasurer, Judge, and all the other positions. Let the people heed their voice. Let them take the advice of those whose positions give it weight, and let them vote and work for the anti-Johnson candidate for every position.

Hon. Henry W. Williams. A WELL-KNOWN Philadelphia lawyer, who is not preeminent for his legal abilities, recently made a long appeal, through the columns of a contemporary "to all parties" to vote for the Hon. George Sharswood for Judge of the Supreme Court. The address was decidedly weak, and we had almost determined not to "pay it even the cold respect of a passing remark."

The writer adroitly commences his wily appeal with a honeyed commendation of Republican principles. But this fulsome exordium is only the prelude to disparaging reflections upon the morality and intellectuality of the Republican candidate. We have repeatedly shown in these columns, and it has never been refuted, that the Hon. Henry W. Williams is as widely respected for his moral worth as Judge Sharswood, whether individually, socially, or officially considered. The writer repeatedly, and with impudent inconsistency, speaks of the Hon. Henry W. Williams as though he was emphatically the political candidate; and he carefully insinuates that he appears to be ashamed to explicitly assert that the acceptance of a nomination made by a political party is a kind of political immorality, especially when the nominee is to run for the Chief Judgeship of the Supreme Court. Cannot every voter who has sufficient intellect to know the meaning of a ballot, perceive that if such acceptance be political immorality, the two candidates are equally guilty? Or, in other words, cannot every voter see that Judge Sharswood is just as significantly the candidate of the Democratic party in this respect as the Hon. Henry W. Williams is the candidate of the Republican party? The writer is wisely silent in regard to the political antecedents of the candidates. We have also irresistibly shown in these columns that the important political antecedents of Judge Sharswood are as unmistakably Democratic as those of our candidate are Republican. For twenty years Judge Sharswood has been one of the most devoted political disciples of the great South Carolina traitor, John C. Calhoun. He has judicially attempted to invalidate the national currency by deciding that the legal tenders of the Government are illegal and un-

constitutional. So that all the assiduous, labored prating of Mr. Brown about the political candidate, which constitutes one of the two great burdens of his appeal, is ridiculously shallow. While upon this subject of political, we perhaps ought to allude to the writer's affirmed concurrence in the doctrine of the Democratic programme, "that a wise, upright, and fearless judiciary is the great bulwark of public safety and individual rights." We need only remark that if the wisdom, uprightness, and fearlessness implied in this Democratic programme are the same kind as are practiced by the Democratic judiciary of New York city, and of some other places even less Democratic, all honest Republicans prefer not to concur in this cardinal Democratic doctrine. In comparing the intellectuality of the candidates, the writer is equally unfortunate. He reasons thus:—The Republican candidate is forty-six years of age, and the Democratic candidate fifty-five; therefore the latter is incomparably the superior in intellectuality. This is the veritable reasoning of a lawyer who includes the judiciary in the classes of persons to whom he complacently appeals. The historical annals of ancient and modern times all attest that the majority of the massive intellects of the world have matured at the age of forty-five. Not only are the mental faculties of the Hon. Henry W. Williams matured and in full vigor, but they have been rigorously disciplined by a varied judicial experience of no ordinary character during the sixteen years that he sat upon the bench of the District Court of Allegheny county. His decisions have reflected eminent legal attainments, and even when appealed from they have generally been affirmed by the Superior Court, with marked expressions of approval—the Superior Judges not unfrequently being satisfied to affirm the judgment solely for the reasons expressed by the Judge below. It is generally conceded that our candidate possesses rare analytical and inductive powers of mind. Such an intellect must necessarily be endowed with a large and liberal comprehensiveness, which sees all round and all through every subject, and which therefore studies and judges everything in all its relations—the very quality of mind that is preeminently needed on a Supreme Judge. For him, then, we confidently bespeak the votes of our citizens on the ground of legal ability and tried patriotism.

The Denial of the Sponsors.

The sponsors of the Independent (?) candidate for Judge, Hon. James R. Ludlow, see fit to deny the truth of the extract published by us, from a speech made by that gentleman at the house of the Washington Engine Company. A card signed by W. J. McElroy says:—

"The Committee of Superintendence of the Independent friends of Judge Ludlow had their attention called to a paragraph in THE EVENING TELEGRAPH of Friday last, which charges that gentleman with the utterance of sentiments at a public meeting favorable to a dissolution of the Union."

They then utterly deny the truth of the statement, and conclude that "Against such testimony the anonymous charge above referred to can have no weight. The re-election of Judge Ludlow is a matter in the hands of an intelligent community accustomed to do its own thinking. This is, to our mind, rather a cool paragraph. In the first place, the 'Independent friends' (?) call the paragraph in THE EVENING TELEGRAPH anonymous. It is not customary for editorial articles to have the editor's name signed to them; but we never before heard that they were not worthy of credit on that account. The true state of the case is clear. The paragraph which states that he said, 'IF WILLIAM H. SEWARD SHOULD BE ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WOULD BE IN FAVOR OF A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION, and, moreover, the South would be justified in dissolving the Union' in case of such an event," is true in every particular. It is a bona fide extract from a report of the speech delivered by Judge Ludlow on that occasion, and we have every reason to believe that it is what the Judge really uttered. We were not present, but when the report of the speech appeared with that paragraph in it, it was not denied by Judge Ludlow, which is pretty good evidence that he was not opposed to its sentiments. Who Mr. McElroy is we have not the pleasure of knowing, but if he has much regard for his reputation for veracity, we would advise him to be careful how he denies facts which are capable of proof. There are many living who heard that speech of Judge Ludlow; let them deny our statements. And we will go further. If Judge Ludlow will furnish us with a copy of his speech—and he doubtless has preserved a copy of the printed report—we will publish it without charge in our paper, and let our readers see whether or not our extract is correct. We know of what we write, and even if not restrained by morality, yet policy would restrain us from publishing such a statement if we were not sure that we spoke the truth. We repeat our words. Judge Ludlow did say in the speech referred to that

"IF WILLIAM H. SEWARD SHOULD BE ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WOULD BE IN FAVOR OF A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION, and, moreover, the South would be justified in dissolving the Union in case of such an event."

The City Press and the City Treasurer. The cordial and almost unanimous endorsement by the city press of Mr. Jones, for Treasurer, is gratifying to all who desire a proper man in that position. But for the opposition of the daily Democratic organ, there would scarcely be heard a dissenting voice from the press respecting Mr. Jones' high claims to public confidence and esteem. Even a Democratic Sunday paper says that "Mr. David Jones, the candidate for City Treasurer, has filled a responsible position for many years, and the fidelity with which he has discharged his trust, the integrity which has characterized all his acts, the promptness with which he has fulfilled every reasonable expectation, no less than his great personal worth, have elicited the encomiums of the press and all having business with his department;" while the Republican papers are unanimous and earnest in their encomiums upon the excellent character and capacity of Mr. Jones.